DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 308 CE 055 614

AUTHOR Mei, Dolores M.; And Others
TITLE A.I.D.P. Part Time Jobs 1988-89. OREA Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
PUB DATE Jul 90
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Attendance; Community Organizations; *Disadvantaged Youth; Dropout Prevention; *Employment Potential; High Schools; *High School Students; *Job Placement; *Job Skills; Part Time Employment; Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; Student Employment
IDENTIFIERS *New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The Part-Time Jobs portion of the Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (AIDP) Program in New York City provided job-readiness training and job placements in an effort to motivate students to improve academic achievement and school attendance. Programs were implemented at schools with a student attendance rate at or below the citywide median of 87 percent. During the 1988-89 school year, 17 community-based organizations provided job-readiness training, counseling, and job placements to students in 24 targeted high schools. Overall, 6,907 students were served by the program. Eighty-four percent (5,786) received job readiness training; of the students who attended at least one readiness session, 51 percent (2,970) obtained jobs. Students worked an average of 19 weeks, had a mean 84 percent school attendance, and passed 68 percent of courses, comparable to the previous year of the program and on a par with the general school population. However, in several schools, student program participants fared better than the rest of the students in both categories. The program was found to be effective in increasing students' job readiness and self-confidence. The quality of the program varied greatly from site to site. Recommendations were made to improve the program by expanding the job preparation/career awareness component, providing teacher/coordinators with more time to administer the program, developing a uniform monitoring plan, and creating an internship component for younger students. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment
Robert Tobias, Director
John E. Schoener, Chief Administrator

ED323308

July 1990

OREA Report

A.I.D.P. Part Time Jobs
1988-89

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared by the OREA
High School Evaluation Unit

Dolores M. Mei
Evaluation Manager

Jan Rosenblum
Evaluation Associate

John Berman
Evaluation Consultant

ED336114

New York City Public Schools
Division of Strategic Planning/Research and Development
Robin Willner, Executive Director

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Gwendolyn C. Baker
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Carol A. Gresser
Westina L. Matthews
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra
Members

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

7/3/90

Summary

During the 1988-89 school year, 17 community-based organizations (C.B.O.s) provided job-readiness training, counseling, and appropriate job placements to students in 24 targeted high schools as part of the A.I.D.P. Part-Time Jobs Program. Overall, 6,907 students were served by the program. Eighty-four percent (5,786) received job readiness training and of the students who attended at least one readiness session, 51 percent (2,970) obtained jobs.

Students worked an average of 19 weeks, a slight increase from the 1987-88 mean of 17.6 weeks. Students mean percent attendance (84 percent) and mean courses passed (68 percent) were comparable to the previous year and roughly on par with the general school population. OREA did find, however, that in several individual school students participating in the A.I.D.P. Part-time Jobs Program fared better than the rest of the students in both categories.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Part-time Jobs Program provided job-readiness training and job placements in an effort to motivate students to improve academic achievement and school attendance. Programs were implemented at schools with a student attendance rate at or below the citywide median of 87 percent. Of the 24 high schools participating in the program, 11 had been designated A.I.D.P. schools and six were Dropout Prevention Program (D.P.P.) schools for the 1988-89 school year. Program activities consisted of job-readiness training, job development, counseling, and job placements. Staff at C.B.O.s developed jobs through contacts in the local community, phone calls to major companies, and through job banks that they had compiled prior to the school year. Job-readiness training emphasized helping students to learn about their interests, skills, and goals. In addition, students practiced filling out job applications, prepared for interviews through role-play exercises, and participated in discussions on employer expectations and job responsibilities. Student were generally placed in jobs as cashiers, stock clerks, sales people, messengers, and office workers.

PROGRAM GOALS

The program's main goal was to use participation in the program and job placement as motivation to help students improve their attendance and academic achievement. The program's stated objectives were for each C.B.O. to serve the contracted number of students by providing them with job-readiness training, counseling, and job placement.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The A.I.D.P. Part-time Jobs Program continues to provide important services to an at-risk student population. Few C.B.O.s or school personnel believe, however, that the jobs themselves provide a motivating force for students to improve their attendance and academic performance and there is little evidence to support this notion. Instead, the increased support services and intervention provided by C.B.O.s were seen as the keys to improving holding power efforts in the schools.

Job-readiness training was again reported to be a highly successful part of the program, providing students with both needed skills and increased self-confidence. Travel time and the placement of students under 16 in jobs was, as in previous years, reported to be a problem for C.B.O.s. All C.B.O.s developed a process to monitor students on the job.

OREA evaluators reported that the quality of the program varied greatly from site to site and that the key factor in determining the success of the program often was the relationship between the individual school and C.B.O.

Based on these findings, the following recommendations are made:

- Broaden and expand the job preparation/career awareness component of the program. Integrate readiness sessions into the regular school schedule if possible.
- Provide teacher/coordinators with a greater time allotment for administering the program.
- Encourage more long term collaborative planning between schools and C.B.O.s.
- Develop a uniform monitoring plan that can be applied consistently among all schools and C.B.O.s.
- Create an internship component for younger students.
- Decrease placement numbers required for C.B.O.s and encourage greater focus on qualitative work with students rather than the number of students placed on jobs.
- Encourage C.B.O.s and schools to be more thorough and conscientious in quantitative record keeping efforts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Program Background	1
	Program Objectives	2
	Evaluation Methodology	2
	Scope of this Report	3
II.	PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	4
	Program Start-up	4
	Job Development	10
III.	QUANTITATIVE OUTCOMES	22
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	25

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

Purpose

The A.I.D.P. Part-time Jobs Program completed its third year in 1988-89. Seventeen Community-Based Organizations (C.B.O.s) received contracts from the Office of Collaborative Programs (O.C.P.) to develop programs designed to provide career education, employment training, and counseling for "at risk" high school students and to place them in part-time unsubsidized jobs. One of the goals of the program was to use these work experiences to help motivate the students to improve their school attendance and academic performance. A more detailed description of program background appears in the 1986-87 evaluation report. *

Population to be Served

The C.B.O.s provided appropriate job-readiness training, job counseling, and job placements to between 75 and 300 "at risk" students in 24 targeted high schools for the 1988-89 school year. Targeted schools were those with an attendance rate at or below the citywide median of 87 percent. Of the 24 high schools participating, 11 were involved in the Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) program, and six were Dropout Prevention Program (D.P.P.) schools. A.I.D.P. schools receive state funding for attendance improvement programs directed at those students considered most at risk of dropping out of school. D.P.P. schools receive tax-levy funds for similar programs

---

* This report entitled "Attemdance Improvement Dropout Prevention Program 1987-88 End-of-Year Report" is available from OREA.

targeted at high-risk students. Three C.B.O.s contracted to provide services for two schools each and, for the first time, two C.B.O.s provided services to three schools. The remaining 12 C.B.O.s each served one high school.

An "at risk" student is defined as someone attending one of the target schools and meeting one of the following criteria:

- participated in A.I.D.P. programs in 1986-87 and/or 1987-88 and is no longer eligible for the program because of improved attendance and/or grades;
- currently in the program and is demonstrating a pattern of improved attendance and/or achievement;
- receiving or eligible for public assistance including but not limited to being eligible for free or reduced price lunches; or
- selected by the principal (or principal's designee) including a student living in temporary housing, or judged to be most likely to benefit from part-time employment.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Program administrators set the following objectives:

- Each school will provide space for the C.B.O. to conduct program activities
- Each C.B.O. will select and assess the contracted number of targeted students.
- Each C.B.O. will serve the contracted number of students by providing job-readiness training, job counseling, and job placements as appropriate.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) obtained age, grade, and eligibility information for all students in the A.I.D.P. Part Time Jobs Program as well as services provided by each C.B.O. In addition, attendance and academic

achievement information for all students in participating schools were gathered from central data files for a two-year period. In March of 1989 evaluators made site visits to ten schools to interview school facilitators and C.B.O. staff. These interviews focused on all aspects of the program including recruitment, job-readiness training, counseling, job development, work-site monitoring procedures, and follow up contact with students. OREA evaluators also observed job-readiness sessions. In addition, a sample of student participants completed questionnaires to determine their reactions to the program. Evaluators from OREA visited an equal sampling of schools/C.B.O.s that had not yet been visited in the first two years of the program, schools/ C.B.O.s where students had averaged a low number of weeks worked in 1987-88, and schools/C.B.O.s where students had averaged a high number of weeks worked in 1987-88. Site visits were made to 10 of the 24 school/C.B.O. pairs.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report describes the implementation and outcomes of the 1988-89 A.I.D.P. Part-Time Jobs Program in 24 participating high schools. A discussion of program implementation and organization is contained in Chapter II. Student outcomes are discussed in Chapter III, and conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter IV.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM START-UP

All 17 C.B.O.s participated in the Part-Time Jobs Program during the previous school year. For the first year, however, several C.B.O.s that had received contracts for the previous two academic years were not refunded. As a result there were four fewer organizations in the program this year along with one less school. One C.B.O., Federation Employment and Guidance Service (FEGS), that served two schools and another, Jobs for Youth, that served one school in 1987-88 each served three schools in 1988-89. Two additional C.B.O.s, Goodwill Industries and the National Puerto Rican Forum that served one school each in 1987-88 served two schools in 1988-89. One school that had been in the program the first two years, Boys and Girls High School, did not choose to participate in 1988-89.

As a result of these changes several C.B.O.s were working with schools for the first time. They included Medgar Evers College with George Westinghouse High School, Boy Scouts of America with High School Redirection and West Side, National Puerto Rican Forum with Theodore Roosevelt High School, and Jobs for Youth with Lehman and Evander Childs High Schools.

Virtually all C.B.O. staff interviewed received funding for the program in July of 1988. Funding requirements generally were determined by the executive directors' of C.B.O.s often in collaboration with the Board of Education. These determinations were based on program and staffing needs and were often made as a

result of the C.B.O.'s experience with similar programs in the past. The number of students each C.B.O served was made through negotiation with the Office of Collaborative Programs (O.C.P.).

The levels of experience and involvement of the school site coordinators differed greatly among the ten schools visited. Of the ten coordinators interviewed, four reported being new to the program in 1988-89. As a result there was considerable disparity in the degree of involvement of the different A.I.D.P. Part-time Jobs program coordinators with those with more experience in the program tending to be more involved in the program on a regular basis. Three of the coordinators interviewed were regular classroom teachers, two were A.I.D.P. facilitators, two were on the guidance or administrative staff, and two were coordinators of New York Working, a career development and employment umbrella organization funded by the New York City Partnership. The majority of coordinators cited their interest, background, and experience as the reasons they chose to accept the position. In three cases the coordinator was encouraged by the principal or assistant principal of the school to take on the job. Most coordinators spent approximately two periods a day on the program. Three noted that they spent considerably more time on the program during the start-up phase.

C.B.O. Staffing

The ten C.B.O.s surveyed all had between two and four full-time staff members working in the Part-time Jobs Program with an average of one part-time staff each. C.B.O. staff usually

consisted of one project manager, one job developer, and one job-readiness trainer. In addition, five C.B.O.s (50 percent) also employed a job counselor.

Staff configuration differed slightly among the different C.B.O.s in the program. Some C.B.O.s employed a core staff who were responsible for all aspects of the program from recruitment to job development to job-readiness workshops. Others had a more clearly delineated division of responsibility with a single staff member responsible for each aspect of the program. Grand Street Settlement, Urban Revitalization Services, Inc., and Staten Island Cooperative Continuum each had project directors who also frequently led job-readiness classes. At Boy Scouts of America one person handled job development and job-readiness classes. By contrast, the Educational Planning Institute employed a project director, job developer, counselor, and job-readiness specialist who each focused primarily on one task. National Puerto Rican Forum hired four part-time employment specialists who alternated leading readiness sessions at Monroe High School. At Manhattan Valley Youth three staff members were involved in job-development activities.

The majority of staff were hired specifically for the program. Only Staten Island Cooperative Continuum which utilized state funds for their staff and Grand Street Settlement which allocated funds from other agency programs for their personnel used monies not specifically allocated in their contract for the Part-time Jobs Program.

Space

As part of the contract for the A.I.D.P. Part-time Jobs Program, participating schools were to provide on-site space for C.B.O. program activities. Although five (50 percent) of the C.B.O.s reported that they were fully satisfied with the amount of space allocated to them, the other 50 percent were not. Site evaluators noted major discrepancies between the office and classroom space provided to the different C.B.O.s they observed. Washington Heights Inwood Development Corporation, for example, was only given space in the cafeteria for recruitment. Job-readiness sessions were held at a church five blocks from the school. As a result students were less likely to make the commitment of attending the training. By contrast, Jobs for Youth had a large office at Lehman High School with ample space for telephone and daily meetings with students as well as a classroom for readiness classes. Several C.B.O.s had adequate facilities for day-to-day working operations but encountered difficulties securing space for job-readiness sessions. At Lafayette High School 12 students were crowded into a small cubicle with a partition for their first readiness class with Urban Revitalization Services. Their project director noted that often there is simply no classroom space available the period when they conduct workshops. The National Puerto Rican Forum maintained all their office space off-site with the exception of recruitment and job-readiness classes.

Recruitment

Sixty percent of school coordinators interviewed stated that they had previously agreed upon the number of students they would refer to the C.B.O. The other 40 percent were unaware of the actual numbers initially proposed and stated that the C.B.O. recruited on its own and that they were not involved in the process. In contrast to 1987-88, only 60 percent of the schools observed said they gave priority to the A.I.D.P. or D.P.P. target population. Predictably, the schools that actually had A.I.D.P. or D.P.P. programs were usually more likely to single out this population group for employment-related services. At Lafayette and Curtis High Schools the coordinator of the Part-time Jobs Program was also the A.I.D.P. faciliator and each of them noted that these students are given priority in selection. But at George Washington, also an A.I.D.P. school, all students were considered eligible on a first come first serve basis.

Similar methods of recruitment were utilized among the schools such as fliers, posters, public address announcements, and formal presentations by the C.B.O. to interested students. In A.I.D.P. and D.P.P. schools eligible students were often contacted by letter. At Curtis High School, notices were sent to all students who had been in the SOAR program the previous year. The coordinator at Lafayette used the instructional lists of the school's Operation Success program to identify prospective students for referral.

Schools differed in their level of involvement in the recruitment process for the program. Generally, the schools most

open ended about which students could be in the program tended to be less involved in referral activities. At George Washington and Herbert Lehman High Schools, Washington Heights Inwood Development Corporation and Jobs for Youth, conducted most of their own recruitment.

The referral procedure followed a similar pattern in most schools. The first step was that students either contacted the C.B.O. through word of mouth or were referred by the school coordinator, guidance counselor or teacher. At 70 percent of the schools the C.B.O.s were expected to provide a list to the coordinator of the students who were referred to them directly. In occasional instances if the coordinator thought that a student's academic performance would be harmed by participation in the program that student could be rejected. The majority of times, however, schools chose to give C.B.O.s complete autonomy on self-referrals and to follow students' attendance and academic progress after they were referred.

Following the referral, students were provided with a brief overview of the program by the C.B.O., invited to the first job-readiness workshop or orientation session, and given permission slips for parents to sign. Often the C.B.O. conducted brief intake interviews at this time and students were told to bring back appropriate documents for the first workshop.

The referral process did differ somewhat between schools mostly due to the level of involvement of the coordinator in the program. Again, schools with A.I.D.P. or D.P.P. programs tended

to keep more extensive records as to which students were referred to the C.B.O. and these schools were also usually more involved in monitoring the student's progress after the referral. The programs at Brandeis, Bushwick, Curtis and Lafayette high schools were good examples of this. Other school coordinators indicated that they were minimally involved in the referral process other than making sure the C.B.O.'s operations were running smoothly. Several school coordinators as well as C.B.O. project directors expressed the opinion that the .2 allotment given to teachers for participating in the Part-time Jobs program did not give coordinators enough time to administer the program effectively.

All the participating schools indicated that they had other part-time jobs programs including Cooperative Education (Co-op), the New York State Employment Program, the Career Ladder Program, and the Vocational Work-Study Program. Ninety percent of the coordinators emphasized, however, that the A.I.D.P. Part-time Jobs Program either provided services these other programs did not such as extensive job preparation or that the Part-time Jobs Program served a far more at-risk, harder to reach population.

JOB DEVELOPMENT

The Job Development Process

As a core component of the program C.B.O.s were contracted to develop jobs in the private and public sector for the targeted student population. These jobs were expected to be in proximity to the students' home or schools whenever possible and to be the type that would help motivate students to improve their

attendance and academic performance. Three of the C.B.O.s employed three full-time staff, four of the C.B.O.s interviewed hired two full-time staff and three assigned one full-time staff to work on job development and placement. This year only one C.B.O., Manhattan Valley Youth, had part-time staff working on job development. The degree and level of experience among job developers varied somewhat. While the majority had direct experience in youth services two, at Grand Street and Educational Planning Institute, had business-related backgrounds.

Seventy percent of the job developers interviewed stated that they had begun the year with a file of 100 to 200 employers and another 20 percent indicated that they had brought a list of work-related contacts from previous jobs. Job developers broadened their lists over the course of the year by identifying employers through telephone contacts, letters, and in-person visits. C.B.O.s also responded to classified ads in local papers and "Help Wanted" signs in neighborhood store windows. Often they targeted specific types of employers or positions through specialized directories. Several C.B.O.s including Jobs for Youth, Grand Street Settlement, and the Washington Heights Inwood Development Corporation noted that they attempted to establish contacts in clerically-oriented office jobs. The Urban Revitalization Services noted that they contacted hospitals for job possibilities and the Educational Planning Institute targeted accounting and law firms as well as doctors' offices. C.B.O.s encountered similar problems to previous years, however, in that

most of the higher level clerical positions ended at 5 P.M. and were based in Manhattan thereby making them untenable for the majority of students in the program.

Many job developers stated that boutiques, department stores and large retail toy and clothing stores were good sources for job leads. Several C.B.O.s commented that fast food chains were the employers of last resort but that because of their high turnover rate and flexible after-school hours they still received a large share of placements as did supermarkets, movie theatres, and messenger services. City agencies such as the Parks Department were also a source for openings. Jobs for Youth, for example, found the Bronx Zoo to be extremely interested in hiring Lehman students.

C.B.O.s encountered numerous problems placing students. Among the most commonly mentioned were: students under sixteen were difficult to place in anything other than fast food, parents were often uncomfortable with the idea of students traveling into Manhattan for work, and student hours of availability were not compatible with employers needs. Other job developers noted that students did not always show up for interviews on time and that attendance problems in school sometimes get translated into attendance problems on the job as well. Staff of Manhattan Valley Youth indicated that racism was sometimes an impediment to placement with a black student population and white relatively affluent concentration of businesses surrounding Brandeis High School. The project director of Urban Revitalization Services

believed that many of the students at Lafayette did not want to work on the commercial strip of 86th Street in Brooklyn because of fears related to racial tensions in the area. He and other C.B.O. staff also commented that many employers have negative stereotypes of teenagers are therefore hesitant in general to hire them.

Job-Readiness Training

Job-readiness training was a central component of the A.I.D.P. Part-time Jobs Program. Seventy percent of the C.B.O.s provided readiness classes at their respective schools. Washington Heights Inwood Development Corporation and Manhattan Valley Youth each held readiness sessions off-site in churches and the National Puerto Rican Forum held no workshops at Theodore Roosevelt and instead met with interested students on a one-to-one basis at their office. These students often received job preparation through classes conducted during the day by the New York Working coordinator at the school. Most C.B.O. job-readiness sessions were between 40 minutes to an hour and the majority of C.B.O.s required students to attend an average of three after school workshops before they could be placed. Manhattan Valley Youth which conducted full-day training (9 A.M. to 3 P.M.) three to four days a month and Grand Street Settlement which held its readiness classes for one period during the regular school day were exceptions. In both these cases students were excused from their regular classes with parental consent to attend the workshops.

C.B.O.s generally took a team approach to job readiness with several staff involved in leading workshops. At Curtis High School the project director, assistant director, job developer, and counselor of Staten Island Cooperative Continuum all participated in the development and facilitation of readiness sessions. Manhattan Valley Youth also utilized its entire Part-time Jobs staff to conduct its full day workshops for Brandeis students. Urban Revitalization Services and the Educational Planning Institute each had two staff conduct readiness sessions together. By contrast, Grand Street Settlement and Boy Scouts of America each had only one staff member responsible for training partially because high turnover in each of these organizations created shortages of program staff.

The content of training sessions was extremely consistent among C.B.O.s. All reported that they worked with students on filling out job applications, role-playing job interviews, and communicating effectively with supervisors and co-workers. Appropriate dress, behavior, and employer expectations were discussed at length. Many C.B.O.s also focused on self-assessment issues and helping students to better identify their interests, skills, and goals as well as giving them an understanding of more long term career planning. Job readiness-curriculum was often culled by the C.B.O. from previously developed material and modified for this population. The "Jobs for the Future" package designed by the Bank Street School of Education was used as a foundation for job-readiness sessions by

several C.B.O.s.

As in previous years, OREA evaluators found that student response to job-readiness classes was generally positive and enthusiastic. In the observed session at Franklin D. Roosevelt High School all nine students in attendance participated in giving and receiving feedback on practice job interviews. The job-readiness trainer and counselor each seemed to project clear direction and positive feedback to the students that would assist them in the future. In the all day workshop at Brandeis the 28 students were broken into four groups covering a variety of issues from attitude to work responsibilities to conflict resolution. The evaluator noted that the energy among students was extremely high and that the C.B.O. facilitators provided an environment where students felt comfortable participating in group activities. Overall, of the students completing the OREA questionnaire nearly 90 percent felt the training they received was either good or very good. A number of school coordinators said that the workshops were, in their opinion, the strongest element of the program.

Although the content of job-readiness sessions was consistently well received several C.B.O. directors reported that it was often difficult to get students to stay for after-school workshops and that building the classes into their regular daily schedule would be an improvement. The project director of Urban Revitalization Services commented that the job-readiness sessions would be more fruitful if there were more efforts to implement

career education in the younger grades.

Job Placement

Most C.B.O.s required students to go through several job-readiness sessions before they could be placed. A few including Staten Island Cooperative Continuum, Grand Street Settlement, and the Washington Heights Inwood Development Corporation said that they did occasionally place students without training if they thought the student was especially mature or had significant prior job experience.

Often job developers or counselors met with students individually prior to completion of their training cycle to determine their interests, skills, and values. A few C.B.O.s used tests or interest inventories in their ongoing work with students. These assessment instruments were used to assist in job placement as well as to give students an understanding of the kinds of work they might want to do in the future. Staten Island Cooperative Continuum used the "Choices Activities Checklist" to demonstrate the relationship between interests and career fields. Urban Revitalization Services gave students the Payes test to determine their attitudes on job-related questions.

Most C.B.O.s developed lists of student job-opportunities which they updated and used for referrals. After training cycles were completed students met with the job developer who tried to match their interests with available work options. C.B.O.s contacted students in class or called them at home when prospective jobs were identified. The job developer or counselor

then met with the student and if there was interest in the position available an interview was scheduled. Several C.B.O.s also included a letter of introduction that they gave to students to bring to the employer.

All C.B.O.s reported that students sometimes refused to go on interviews for certain jobs. The reasons most commonly given were: distance of travel between job and home, parental resistance to the student working, students feeling afraid or anxious about going on the interview, and students not wanting to work at minimum wage jobs. Staff also noted that students were sometimes reluctant to work for an employer who wanted them to come in on weekends.

Monitoring Job Placements

All of the C.B.O.s in the program developed either a formal or informal system for monitoring students once they were on the job. Eighty percent conducted regular in-person site visits to employers at least once a month and 90 percent said they made phone calls to student work-site supervisors at least twice a month and sometimes as often as once a week. Staten Island Cooperative Continuum asked employers to fill out monthly progress reports on the attitude, attendance, and performance of student workers.

Each C.B.O. also maintained individual contact with students once they were placed although some organization's follow-up efforts were more formalized than others. Jobs for Youth and the

National Puerto Rican Forum used student contact sheets and follow-up cards that students were required to fill out as part of their agreement with the C.B.O. The Washington Heights Inwood Development Corporation made phone calls to students once a month.

Relationships between employers and student employees were generally smooth and amiable although difficulties did occur. The most common problems voiced by employers were that students came late to work or were absent without calling ahead. A smaller number of employers cited problems with student attitude or maturity. Student complaints generally concerned employers wanting them to work more hours than originally planned or believing that they deserved more money than they were being paid.

Several C.B.O.s noted that many students lacked an understanding of how to resolve work-related problems without quitting their jobs. As a result, follow up counseling often focused on helping students constructively resolve these difficulties. Jobs for Youth conducted specialized job-retention workshops.

Six C.B.O.s indicated that they regularly obtained student report cards and attendance information from the school. Both school and C.B.O. staff noted that for some students, handling job and school responsibilities was too difficult and their academic performance or attendance suffered as a result. If problems continued over several months students were urged to

suspend their work activities.

Overall, however, C.B.O.s and schools reported that being in the program was beneficial to the students' long term progress. But most staff interviewed stressed that it was less the jobs themselves that created the improvement and more the added intervention of having additional support services available. Eighty percent of the students surveyed said that they did not feel having a job had any effect on their school performance.

Relationship between School and C.B.O.

The quality of the relationship between the school and C.B.O. contributed greatly to determining the success of the program in its work with students. Evaluators found substantial differences in these relationships among the ten schools visited.

Overall, C.B.O.s that had established positive connections with their schools over the first two years of the program tended to continue to have smooth relationships. Three examples are the programs at Brandeis, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Curtis High Schools where both the schools and the C.B.O.s seemed to have a clear sense of what was required of them and, as a result, developed an effective program for students. By contrast, C.B.O.s that entered schools in 1988-89 whose previous relationship with a C.B.O. had been difficult tended to have had more problems. In addition, C.B.O.s that had large staff turnovers or schools that appointed new coordinators encountered more difficulties as well.

In its first year at High School Redirection, Boy Scouts of

America (B.S.A.) hired a new project director in December, was under-staffed throughout the year, and followed in the footsteps of a stormy relationship between the school and a previous C.B.O. The school coordinator noted that B.S.A. staff did not provide them with the mandated monthly reports of students referred to them. At Theodore Roosevelt High School, the National Puerto Rican Forum (N.P.R.F.) received no physical space for job-readiness classes but the school coordinator commented that the C.B.O. was not aggressive enough in seeking out prospective students for placement. Neither Roosevelt nor N.P.R.F. returned completed roster forms or student surveys to OREA as requested.

The Washington Heights-Inwood Development Corporation reported that George Washington High School provided no assistance in generating student referrals and little support overall. Staff at Grand Street Settlement felt that the school coordinator at Bushwick High School only gave them the most difficult students to place who could not be placed in other jobs programs. The school coordinator at Lafayette High School commented that although Urban Revitalization Services did effective work she was disappointed with the C.B.O.s follow-up work with students after they were placed in jobs. She also commented that the C.B.O. did not always adequately respect the decision-making process at the school The C.B.O. expressed the belief that the school sometimes made unfair demands on them. It appears that in all cases where difficulties existed between the C.B.O. and school each party shouldered some of the

responsibility for the relationship not working as well as it could have.

At a number schools, C.B.O. staff assisted A.I.D.P. facilitators with holding power efforts. The counselor for Urban Revitalization Services phoned long term absentees from A.I.D.P. rolls at Lafayette High School to try to get them back into school. Grand Street Settlement developed additional group counseling and guidance activities for Bushwick High School students beyond job readiness and placement. Several school coordinators noted that the C.B.O.s provided an important additional source of intervention and support for students. Students, especially those most alienated from their schools, often felt comfortable "dropping in" to the C.B.O. office to discuss academic and personal problems.

III. QUANTITATIVE OUTCOMES

School and C.B.O. staff completed rosters for 6,907 students in the A.I.D.P. Part-Time Jobs Program in 1988-89. According to these data, only 15 percent of the students were chosen for the program because they met one of the formal A.I.D.P. guidelines. The remainder were selected for other reasons including the individual student's own interest and desire to be part of the program and the belief on the part of guidance or other school staff that the program would benefit the student. Ethnicity data were reported for 90 percent of the participants. Of these students, 65 percent (4,006) were black, 28 percent (1,712) were Hispanic, four percent (263) were white, and two percent (117) were Asian/Pacific Islander.

Overall, 43 percent of the (2,970) students received jobs through this program; 605 got a second job, and 80 were reported to have obtained third jobs. As in 1987-88, cashier (24 percent) and stock clerk (14 percent) were the two jobs students most frequently obtained followed by office worker (11 percent), counterperson (10 percent), salesperson (9 percent), and messenger (6 percent).

Forty-four percent (1,295) of the students who received jobs left these positions sometime during the year. Thirty-one percent reported leaving because they disliked the job, 17 percent left because the job was discontinued, 10 percent found

managing the job and school together to be too difficult, nine percent reported leaving for a better job. The remaining 33 percent of the students were reportedly dismissed for various reasons including poor performance or poor attendance.

The average number of weeks worked was 19, slightly higher than the figure for 1987-88. The longest placement average was from Staten Island Cooperative Continuum whose students worked an average of 42 weeks. FEGS at DeWitt Clinton (24 weeks), Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association (21 weeks), and Banana Kelly (20 weeks) all kept students working longer than average. Interestingly, none of the C.B.O.s reporting the highest average number of weeks worked by students for 1988-89 were the same as the previous year.

Attendance eligibility data were reported for 55 percent (N= 3,775) of those students. These students in the program were in attendance at their school 84 percent of possible days. This is slightly above the mean of 82 percent for students not in the program and is a three percent improvement over mean attendance from 1987-88. Data shows that while there were minimal differences in mean attendance between Part-time Jobs students and the overall student population at many of the schools, students at several other schools showed markedly higher attendance rates. At George Washington High School, Part-time jobs students were in attendance 88 percent of possible days compared to 81 percent of the rest of the student population. Students in the Part-time Jobs Program at Julia Richman were

present 84 percent of possible days, compared to 80 percent of the general student population. At Evander Childs High School, Part-time Jobs Students were in attendance 89 percent of possible days compared to 83 percent of the rest of the school.

Data on academic achievement shows a similar pattern. Students in the A.I.D.P. Part-time Jobs Program passed 68 percent of their courses in the 1988-89 compared to the overall school average of 65 percent, a minimal difference. But at individual schools there were some strong differences. Martin Luther King, Jr. High School students in the Part-time Jobs program passed 79 percent of their classes compared to a mean of 71 percent for the rest of the school's population. Dewitt Clinton High School students passed an average of 68 percent of their classes compared to only 58 percent for the rest of the students. Students in the Part-time Jobs program at Erasmus Hall High School passed an average of 79 percent of their classes while the general student population passed an average of only 67 percent of their classes.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1988-89 A.I.D.P. Part-time Jobs Program was most valuable in its ability to reach a large number of at-risk students through job-readiness training, individual counseling, and additional support services. In a majority of the ten schools visited the C.B.O.s in the program filled a significant void by giving students a drop-in space and resource that felt largely independent of the school. In many instances, C.B.O. staff used jobs as "carrots" to begin developing relationships with students that could serve as motivation for them to improve their school attendance and academic performance. The jobs were rarely seen as motivators themselves. Staff commented that students' attendance and school performance was as likely to suffer as it was to improve as a result of having a job and that the majority of times it had little direct impact one way or the other. But school coordinators frequently noted that the C.B.O.'s presence provided an additional holding power resource that made a significant difference on a day-to-day basis. Two C.B.O. directors stated that they thought the job focus of the program should be de-emphasized and required placement numbers lowered. Another said that jobs should be more closely linked with changes in attitude and academic performance; more of a reward instead of a motivating tool for student improvement in school.

Job-readiness training continues to be well received by

both staff and students. The experience students gained in filling out job applications, presenting themselves successfully on interviews, communicating effectively with supervisors and co-workers, and learning to identify skills and interests helped increase their confidence and self-esteem. Several C.B.O. staff did comment that sessions would reach more students if they could be integrated into the school schedule rather than given at the end of the day. In addition, readiness sessions held outside school grounds tended to be more difficult to motivate students to attend. Other suggestions included having more staff available for individual job counseling and allowing students to gain academic credit for attending readiness classes.

Students were placed in jobs after the completion of the job-readiness training cycle. The number of classes required before placements were made differed among C.B.O.s with the average being three sessions. Older students or students with significant job experience were sometimes placed without being required to attend readiness workshops. As in past years students who were under 16 years of age were difficult to place and the program should again explore the idea of developing an internship component for these younger students. The distance between school or home and the job site was also noted as a problem in a number of placements although it was voiced with somewhat less frequency than in the previous year.

All schools and C.B.O.s reported that they were involved in monitoring student job placements but there continues to be a

lack of a uniform monitoring standard that can be applied to all program participants.

Evaluators found that the relationship between the school and C.B.O. was the most significant element in measuring the overall success of the program. A number of schools and C.B.O.s experienced communication problems and unsatisfied expectations of the other party's role in program administration. OREA found that these difficulties were usually a two way street and that both C.B.O.s and schools shared some responsibility for the problems. Contracts should be carefully awarded to insure that both the schools and C.B.O.s selected for inclusion in the program have a clear expectations of each other's role and a commitment to working together for the benefit of the students. Sixty percent of the schools visited commented that increased parental involvement would also strengthen the program greatly.

Based on these findings the following recommendations are made:

- Broaden and expand the job preparation/career awareness component of the program. Integrate readiness sessions into the regular school schedule if possible.
- Provide teacher/coordinators with a greater time allotment for administering the program.
- Encourage more long term collaborative planning between schools and C.B.O.s.
- Develop a uniform monitoring plan that can be applied consistently among all schools and C.B.O.s.
- Create an internship component for younger students.
- Decrease placement numbers required for C.B.O.s and encourage greater focus on qualitative work with students rather than the number of students placed on jobs.

- Encourage C.B.O.s and schools to be more thorough and conscientious in quantitative record keeping efforts.